

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

February 4, 1999 LB 59

idea at all. However, I don't think that there's, on examination, I don't think that you will find that there's great waste in the administration of the funds, but certainly all those things should be subject to constant review. But I don't think that the proper mechanism for constant review is to put sunset clauses on all of these things. I would think that if you're going to take something out of operation you ought to do it for some reason that's been stated and argued and has won you over on the floor, rather than just assuming everything should be sunsetted and then we'll talk about it. If you're going to operate that way, maybe we should sunset all government operations and start all over again on every one that we philosophically feel is inappropriate or wherever we feel there might be some waste. I think the better approach is the one that was talked about by most folks earlier and that is for those who are interested in these particular programs to have an interim study over the...between sessions, as we normally do on things of this scale, and if somebody...if the conclusion of that study is that things should be done differently or one fund or another should be eliminated, then proceed to do that. That would be our ordinary fashion, our ordinary method of working on things. It is a logical method of working on things. There's no particular crisis here. The money is still needed. So I would...I would ask that you reject this particular amendment. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator. The Chair recognizes Senator Redfield.

SENATOR REDFIELD: Thank you, Mr. President, members of the body. I don't think the question here really is whether it's a good purpose or not. I think all of us would agree that recycling's a good purpose. I've been accused of never throwing anything away. But I think that we also need to look at the issue of who is paying for this fund and, as we look at it, we see that it's very indiscriminate in its addressing only retailers. It is those who pay sales tax and, yet, it doesn't look at the fact of whether they are truly the ones who are causing the litter problem. We see jewelry stores, we see bicycle shops, we even see lawn mower shops who are being taxed this way or charged this fee, and we know that those lawn mower shops are actually selling the mulcher lawn mowers who reduce